



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/581,810	03/12/2007	Luis Miguel Ortega Mora	HERR13.001APC	1935

20995 7590 07/08/2008
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP
2040 MAIN STREET
FOURTEENTH FLOOR
IRVINE, CA 92614

EXAMINER

NAVARRO, ALBERT MARK

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1645

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

07/08/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jcartee@kmob.com
eOAPilot@kmob.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/581,810	ORTEGA MORA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mark Navarro	1645	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 March 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-3, 5-8, 10-14, 19 and 20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9 and 15-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/13/07</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of Group II, claims 9 and 15-18 in the reply filed on March 20, 2008 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that that the publication of Risco Gastillo is after the claim of benefit of Spanish Patent Application P200302869, filed December 4, 2003, and therefore cannot be used in a finding of lack of unity. This is not found persuasive because the foreign priority filing date must antedate the reference and be perfected. The filing date of the priority document is not perfected unless applicant has filed a certified priority document in the application (and an English language translation, if the document is not in English) (see 37 CFR 1.55(a)(3)) and the examiner has established that the priority document satisfies the enablement and description requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Furthermore, Applicants have elected the protein and not the DNA, and will find an additional rejection under 35 USC 102(b) below which defeats unity of invention.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claim Objections

1. Claims 15-18 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim because a claim cannot depend on multiple claims for different limitations. See MPEP § 608.01(n).

Claims 15-18 will be examined only to the extent that they depend on the polypeptide of claim 9.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

2. Claims 9 and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 9 and 15-16 are directed to compositions comprising proteins which have the same characteristics and utility as proteins found naturally and therefore does not constitute as patentable subject matter.

In the absence of the hand of man, naturally occurring products are considered non-statutory subject matter. Diamond v. Chakrabarty, 206 USPQ 193 (1980). Mere purity of naturally occurring product does not necessarily impart patentability. Ex parte Siddiqui 156 USPQ 426 (1966). However when purity results in new utility, patentability is considered. Merck Co. V. Chase Chemical Co. 273 F. Supp 68 (1967). See also American Wood v. Fiber Disintegrating Co., 90 US 566 (1974); American Fruit Growers v. Brogdex Co. 283 US 1 (1931); Funk Brothers Seed Co. V. Kalo Inoculant Co. 33 US 127 (1948). Filing of evidence of a new utility imparted by the increased purity of the claimed invention and amendment to the claims to recite the essential purity of the claimed products is suggested to obviate this rejection. For example, "An isolated polypeptide..."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. Claims 9 and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time

the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This is a written description rejection.

Claims 9 and 15-18 recite chemically or enzymatically modified sequences derived from sequences homologous to SEQ ID NO: 10 conserving their antigenic characteristics.

The specification and claims do not indicate what distinguishing attributes are shared by the members of the genus. Thus, the scope of the claims includes numerous structural variants, and the genus is highly variant because a significant number of structural differences between genus members is permitted. Since the disclosure fails to describe the common attributes or characteristics that identify members of the genus, and because the genus is highly variant, “chemically or enzymatically modified sequences derived from sequences homologous to SEQ ID NO: 10 conserving their antigenic characteristics” alone is insufficient to describe the genus. One of skill in the art would reasonably conclude that the disclosure fails to provide a representative number of species to describe the genus. There is no teaching regarding amino acids can vary from SEQ ID NO: 10, and still result in a protein that conserves its antigenic characteristics. Furthermore, there is no disclosed or art-recognized correlation between any structure other than SEQ ID NO: 10 and the activity of conserving antigenic characteristics. Thus, applicant was not in possession of the claimed genus.

Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and a reference to a potential method of isolating it. The protein itself is required. See *Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ 2d 1601 at 1606 (CAFC 1993) and *Amgen Inc.*

V. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Lts., 18 USPQ2d 1016.

Vas-Cath Inc. V. Mahurkar, 19 USPQ2d 111, clearly states that “applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of the invention. The invention is, for purposes of the 'written description' inquiry, whatever is now claimed.” The specification does not “clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed.”

Applicant is reminded that Vas-Cath make clear that the written description provision of 35 USC 112 is severable from its enablement provision.

Furthermore, in *The Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly* (43 USPQ2d 1398-1412), the court held that a generic statement which defines a genus by only their functional activity does not provide an adequate written description of the genus. The court indicated that while Applicants are not required to disclose every species encompassed by a genus, the description of a genus is achieved by the recitation of a representative number of DNA molecules, usually defined by a nucleotide sequence, falling within the scope of the claimed genus. At section B(1), the court states that “An adequate written description of a DNA... requires a precise definition, such as by structure, formula, chemical name, or physical properties, not a mere wish or plan for obtaining the claimed chemical invention.”

Applicants are directed to the Guidelines for the Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C. 112, 1 “Written Description” Requirement, the guidelines can be found at the following link on the USPTO Internet in “Patents

Guidance.”

<http://www.uspto.gov/web/patents/guides.htm>

4. Claims 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for immunogenic compositions, does not reasonably provide enablement for vaccine compositions. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Facts that should be considered in determining whether a specification is enabling, or if it would require an undue amount of experimentation to practice the invention include: (1) the quantity of experimentation necessary to practice the invention, (2) the amount of direction or guidance presented, (3) the presence or absence of working examples, (4) the nature of the invention, (5) the state of the prior art, (6) the relative skill of those in the art, (7) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and (8) the breadth of the claims. See In re Wands, 858 F.2d 731,737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1403 (Fed. Cir. 1988). The Federal Circuit has noted, however, that only those factors that are relevant based on the facts need to be addressed. See Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Calgene, Inc. 188 F.3d 1362, 1371, 52 USPQ2d 1129, 1135 (Fed. Cir 1999).

First, Choromanski et al (US Publication 2005/0186227) sets forth that “Although neosporosis, especially in cattle, appears to pose an increasingly serious problem and there is certainly a long felt need to solve this problem by protecting mammals using a

vaccine, there are no descriptions of vaccines, vaccine development nor suggestions of methods of preparing vaccines to protect cattle and other animals from disease cause by Neospora. (See summary).

Second, Innes et al (Trends in Parasitology Vol. 18 (11) pp 497-504, 2002) set forth that developing an effective vaccine against *N. caninum* presents several interesting challenges, including the parasite is spread efficiently from mother to fetus over several generations. (See abstract).

Furthermore, Applicants specification provides no working examples showing protection, or how to overcome the difficulties and challenges of the nature of the invention as described by Choromanski et al and Innes et al.

A vaccine “must by definition trigger an immunoprotective response in the host vaccinated; mere antigenic response is not enough.” In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557,1561, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Given the lack of guidance, lack of working examples, and the unpredictable nature of the invention, one of skill in the art would be forced into excessive experimentation in order to practice the instantly claimed invention.

5. Claims 9 and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claims are vague and indefinite in the recitation of “chemically or enzymatically modified sequences derived from sequences homologous to SEQ ID NO:

10.” One of skill in the art would be unable to determine the metes and bounds of the claimed invention. For instance what amount of homology to SEQ ID NO: 10 is required to be considered homologous (90% identity, 70%, 40%, etc). Similarly, at what point is the homology sufficiently divergent to no longer be considered a modified sequence derived from SEQ ID NO: 10. Without a clear definition of the term chemically or enzymatically modified sequences derived from sequences homologous to SEQ ID NO: 10, one of skill in the art would be unable to determine the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

6. Claims 9 and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claim is vague and indefinite in the recitation of “derived from SEQ ID NO: 10.” Since it is unclear what amount of chemical modification is permitted as implied by the recitation of “derived.” Since it is unclear how the proteins are to be derived as referred to in the claims, there is no way for the person of skill in the art to ascribe a discrete and identifiable definition to said phrase.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 1645

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 9 and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Krishnan et al.

The claims are drawn to a polypeptide selected from a) antigen protein NcSAG4 of *N. caninum*, comprising SEQ ID NO: 10, b) chemically or enzymatically modified sequences derived from sequences homologous to SEQ ID NO: 10 conserving their antigenic characteristics, c) NcSAG4 polypeptides derived from SEQ ID NO: 10 conserving their antigenic characteristics and d) a recombinant protein including protein or polypeptide of a), b), or c).

Krishnan et al (US Patent Number 6,436,410) disclose of immunogenic compositions comprising a *N. caninum* dihydrofolate reductase-thymidylate synthase in combination with a cytokine for eliciting an immune response. (See summary, abstract and claims).

Given that the protein disclosed by Krishnan et al shares a degree of homology or can be derived from SEQ ID NO: 10 via a certain amount of amino acid insertions, substitutions and/or deletions, the protein disclosed by Krishnan et al is deemed to anticipate the instantly filed claims.

Art Unit: 1645

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Navarro whose telephone number is (571) 272-0861.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shannon Foley can be reached on (571) 272-0898. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Mark Navarro/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1645
July 1, 2008